

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
WESTERN DIVISION

GLORIA GARRET,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	Civ. No. <u>05-2639-Ma/P</u>
)	
AMERICAN INTERNATIONAL GROUP,)	
INC., et al.,)	
)	
Defendants,)	

ELMO THOMAS)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	Civ No. <u>05-2651-Ma/P</u>
)	
AMERICAN INTERNATIONAL GROUP,)	
INC., et al.,)	
)	
Defendants,)	

ROOSEVELT WALTON,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	Civ. No. <u>05-2652-D/P</u>
)	
AMERICAN INTERNATIONAL GROUP,)	
INC., et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO COMPEL RULE 26(a)(1) INITIAL
DISCLOSURES AND RESPONSES TO REMAND-RELATED DISCOVERY



Before the court is Defendant's Motion to Compel Rule 26(a)(1) Initial Disclosures and Responses to Remand-Related Discovery, filed December 22, 2005 (dkt #25, #22, #17 respectively). Local Rule 7.2(a)(2) requires that

the response to the motion and its supporting memorandum . . . shall be filed within fifteen days after service of the motion and shall be accompanied by a proposed order. Failure to respond timely to any motion, other than one requesting dismissal of a claim or action, may be deemed good grounds for granting the motion.

The plaintiffs have not responded to the motion, and the time for filing a response has passed. Therefore, the motion is GRANTED. Plaintiff shall provide initial disclosures and respond to defendant's interrogatories and requests for production of documents, related to remand issues as requested in defendant's motion to compel, within eleven (11) days from the date of this order.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

S/ Tu M. Pham

TU M. PHAM
United States Magistrate Judge

January 25, 2006

Date

¹The corresponding motions to compel previously filed in this case are likewise granted (dkt #29, #26, and #21).